

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Richmond Division**

**RONALD WAYNE LEWIS,**

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. **3:10CV130**

Civil Action No. **3:10CV568**

Civil Action No. **3:10CV684**

**HARLEY LAPPIN, et al.,**

Defendants.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Ronald Wayne Lewis, a former federal prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed these *Bivens*<sup>1</sup> actions. Because Plaintiff's three civil actions raise the same claim and are largely duplicitous, the Court will consolidate their adjudication. *Williams v. Vinson*, Nos. 1:08cv851 (LMB/TCB), 1:08cv852 (LMB/JFA), 1:08cv853 (LMB/TRJ), 2008 WL 7073539, at \*1 n.1 (E.D. Va. Aug. 26, 2008). The matter is before the Court for evaluation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A. Jurisdiction is appropriate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b) and 1343(a)(3).

**Preliminary Review**

This Court must dismiss any action filed by a prisoner if the Court determines the action (1) "is frivolous" or (2) "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The first standard includes claims based upon "an indisputably meritless legal theory," or claims where the "factual contentions are clearly baseless." *Clay v. Yates*, 809 F. Supp. 417, 427 (E.D. Va. 1992) (*quoting Neitzke v. Williams*,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989)). The second standard is the familiar standard for a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

“A motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) tests the sufficiency of a complaint; importantly, it does not resolve contests surrounding the facts, the merits of a claim, or the applicability of defenses.” *Republican Party of N.C. v. Martin*, 980 F.2d 943, 952 (4th Cir. 1992) (citing 5A Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1356 (1990)). In considering a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, a plaintiff’s well-pleaded allegations are taken as true and the complaint is viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Mylan Labs., Inc. v. Matkari*, 7 F.3d 1130, 1134 (4th Cir. 1993); see also *Martin*, 980 F.2d at 952. This principle applies only to factual allegations, however, and “a court considering a motion to dismiss can choose to begin by identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950 (2009).

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure “require[] only ‘a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,’ in order to ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.’” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (second alteration in original) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Plaintiffs cannot satisfy this standard with complaints containing only “labels and conclusions” or a “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Id.* at 555 (citations omitted). Instead, a plaintiff must allege facts sufficient “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level,” *id.* (citation omitted), stating a claim that is “plausible on its face,” *id.* at 570, rather than merely “conceivable.” *Id.* “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads

factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1499 (citing *Bell Atl. Corp.*, 550 U.S. at 556). Therefore, in order for a claim or complaint to survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, the plaintiff must “allege facts sufficient to state all the elements of [his or] her claim.” *Bass v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co.*, 324 F.3d 761, 765 (4th Cir. 2003) (citing *Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.*, 309 F.3d 193, 213 (4th Cir. 2002); *Iodice v. United States*, 289 F.3d 270, 281 (4th Cir. 2002)).

Lastly, while the Court liberally construes *pro se* complaints, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), it does not act as the inmate’s advocate, *sua sponte* developing statutory and constitutional claims the inmate failed to clearly raise on the face of his complaint. *See Brock v. Carroll*, 107 F.3d 241, 243 (4th Cir. 1997) (Luttig, J., concurring); *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

### **Summary of Claim**

Plaintiff has two scrotal cysts. Plaintiff contends that the doctors at Federal Correctional Institution - Medium, located in Petersburg, Virginia (“FCI Petersburg”), should have conducted a biopsy to determine if the cysts were cancerous and should have recommended surgery to prevent potential problems. Plaintiff contends that the cysts are causing discomfort and pain. He is concerned that he might lose a testicle and that he will be unable to procreate. Plaintiff alleges a cause of medical malpractice and a denial of medical attention. He seeks an award of at least \$85,000,000.

### Analysis

In order to state an Eighth Amendment<sup>2</sup> claim, a plaintiff must allege facts that suggest:

(1) that objectively the deprivation suffered or harm inflicted was “‘sufficiently serious,’ and

(2) that subjectively the prison officials acted with a ‘sufficiently culpable state of mind.’”

*Johnson v. Quinones*, 145 F.3d 164, 167 (4th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Wilson v. Seiter*, 501 U.S. 294, 298 (1991)). With respect to the denial of adequate medical care, “a prisoner must allege acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.”

*Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976). A medical need is “serious” if it “‘has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious that even a lay person would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor’s attention.’” *Iko v. Shreve*, 535 F.3d 225, 241 (4th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Henderson v. Sheahan*, 196 F.3d 839, 846 (7th Cir. 1999)); see *Webb v. Hamidullah*, 281 F. App’x 159, 165 (4th Cir. 2008) (citing *Ramos v. Lamm*, 639 F.2d 559, 575 (10th Cir. 1980)).

Regarding the second, subjective prong, “[d]eliberate indifference is a very high standard—a showing of mere negligence will not meet it.” *Grayson v. Peed*, 195 F.3d 692, 695 (4th Cir. 1999) (citing *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 105-06); see *Davis v. Stanford*, 382 F. Supp. 2d 814, 820 (E.D. Va. 2004), *aff’d*, 127 F. App’x 680 (4th Cir. 2005) (“[M]alpractice is not enough to constitute an Eighth Amendment violation.” (citations omitted)). Deliberate indifference requires the plaintiff to allege facts that suggest that a particular defendant actually knew of and disregarded a substantial risk of serious harm to his person. See *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S.

---

<sup>2</sup> “Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.” U.S. Const. amend. VIII.

825, 837 (1994). Furthermore, absent exceptional circumstances, an inmate's disagreement with medical personnel with respect to a course of treatment is insufficient to state a cognizable constitutional claim, much less demonstrate deliberate indifference. *See Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 849 (4th Cir. 1985) (citing *Gittlemacker v. Prasse*, 428 F.2d 1, 6 (3d Cir. 1970)).

In this case, Plaintiff has submitted ample evidence that, while he was incarcerated, he was treated for his scrotal cysts. Doctors prescribed Plaintiff antibiotics and he saw a urologist who administered an ultrasound. Doctors prescribed a host of other medications, including pain medication. Plaintiff's treatment was referred to Riverside Regional Medical Center, where Plaintiff obtained treatment.

When a Plaintiff receives medical treatment on numerous occasions from various doctors, his disagreement with the course of treatment does not create a claim arising under the Eighth Amendment. *Id.* (holding that a plaintiff's dissatisfaction with a doctor's treatment does not state a claim for deliberate indifference). In evaluating a prisoner's complaint regarding medical care, the Court is mindful that "society does not expect that prisoners will have unqualified access to health care" or to the medical treatment of their choosing. *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992) (citing *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 103-04). In this regard, the right to medical treatment is limited to that treatment which is medically necessary and not to "that which may be considered merely desirable." *Bowring v. Godwin*, 551 F.2d 44, 48 (4th Cir. 1977); *see also United States v. Clawson*, --- F.3d ----, No. 10-4568, 2011 WL 2572986, at \*7 (4th Cir. June 30, 2011).

Plaintiff's insistence that he is in pain likewise fails to state a claim. "It would be nice if after appropriate medical attention pain would immediately cease, its purpose fulfilled; but life is not so accommodating. Those recovering from even the best treatment can experience pain."

*Snipes v. DeTella*, 95 F.3d 586, 592 (7th Cir. 1996). The Eighth Amendment does not require “prison doctors to keep an inmate pain-free in the aftermath of proper medical treatment.” *Id.* So long as medical staff respond reasonably to an inmate’s complaints of pain, the inmate’s Eighth Amendment rights are not violated. *See Brown v. Harris*, 240 F.3d 383, 389-90 (4th Cir. 2001). Because the reasonableness of any such response usually calls for a medical judgment, “[w]hether and how pain associated with medical treatment should be mitigated is for doctors to decide free from judicial interference, except in the most extreme situations.” *Snipes*, 95 F.3d at 592; *Gobert v. Caldwell*, 463 F.3d 339, 346 (5th Cir. 2006) (“[T]he decision whether to provide additional treatment is a classic example of a matter for medical judgment.” (quoting *Domino v. Tex. Dep’t of Crim. Justice*, 239 F.3d 752, 756 (5th Cir. 2001) (internal quotation marks omitted))).

The doctors’ decisions not to conduct surgery or conduct further testing is the sort of medical decision that exceeds the scope of judicial review. *Russell v. Sheffer*, 528 F.2d 318, 319 (4th Cir. 1975); *see Self v. Crum*, 439 F.3d 1227, 1232 (10th Cir. 2006) (“Matters that traditionally fall within the scope of medical judgment are such decisions as whether to consult a specialist or undertake additional medical testing.” (citing *Ledoux v. Davies*, 931 F.2d 1536, 1537 (10th Cir. 1992))); *Gobert*, 463 F.3d at 346. No allegations suggest that the doctors’ decisions were “sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.” *Estelle*, 429 U.S. at 106. Plaintiff does not allege that Defendants “refused to treat him, ignored his complaints, intentionally treated him incorrectly, or engaged in any similar conduct.” *Gobert*, 463 F.3d at 346 (quoting *Domino*, 329 F.3d at 756). Plaintiff has failed to state a claim

upon which relief can be granted for violation of his Eighth Amendment rights. Accordingly, it is RECOMMENDED that the actions be DISMISSED.


Plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry hereof. Such objections should be numbered and identify with specificity the legal or factual deficiencies of the Magistrate Judge's findings. Failure to timely file specific objections to the Report and Recommendation may result in the entry of an Order dismissing the complaints. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). It may also preclude further review or appeal from such judgment. *See Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985). Petitioner may only file one set of objections bearing all three case numbers to which this Report and Recommendation applies.

If Plaintiff wishes to file an amended complaint to correct the deficiencies described above, he must submit an amended complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry hereof. *See Williams v. Wilkerson*, 90 F.R.D. 168 (E.D. Va. 1981). Such complaint must set forth legibly, in separately numbered paragraphs, a short statement of the facts giving rise to each claim against each defendant. Plaintiff must also state what civil rights he believes each defendant violated and explicitly state how said defendant's actions violated each constitutional right. Any amended complaint will supplant the current complaints and all prior submissions. The amended complaint must stand or fall of its own accord. Plaintiff may only file one amended complaint bearing the three case numbers to which this Report and Recommendation applies.

The Clerk is DIRECTED to send a copy of the Report and Recommendation to Plaintiff.

And it is so ORDERED.

Date: 8/8/11  
Richmond, Virginia

\_\_\_\_\_/s/   
M. Hannah Lauck  
United States Magistrate Judge